

But they are not alone. Imagine how World War II might have turned out had we not had the code talkers.

In 1990, with Senator INOUE's leadership, Congress established the Native American Languages Act to "preserve, protect and promote the rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, practice and develop Native American languages."

Last year, Senator INOUE introduced amendments to that law to support the creation within tribal communities of immersion schools and language survival "nests," to teach these languages to the next generation.

Let's pass those amendments this year. There is no time to waste.

Let's also work together to adequately fund Indian schools and to include in all Federal education policies the flexibility tribal educators need to include native languages, history and culture in their curriculums.

Indian parents, and tribal leaders and educators, in South Dakota care deeply about this. And President Bush specifically called for such flexibility in the Executive order on Indian education he signed less than three months ago.

Soldiers go to war to give their children the chance to live better lives. What better way can we honor the code talkers than to support schools in which their descendants can learn the native languages that helped to save our Nation?

The result of such efforts will be a healthier, happier Indian population. And who knows what we will all learn in the process?

Mr. President, these remarks have been translated into Lakota by Elizabeth Little Elk, a member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe. I ask unanimous consent that the Lakota translation of my words be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONORING NATIVE AMERICAN HEROES,
PRESERVING NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES

Tunkasila Mila Hanska Oyate ki lel un gluwitapi. Na taku le ecunkupi ke he, wiyan nahan wicasa le un okicize el un pelo. Iyotan winyan na wicasa kowakatan unpi hel Iraq nahan Afghanistan. Takuwe heciya unpi ki hena oyate ki nawicakinjin pelo.

Le hihani ki taku wan iwowablakin kte ehani wicasa eya makasitomani okicize el apa pelo.

Lena akicita ki tokeske wacinwicayau ki he ta wowiye ki un woglakapi, ho nahan he un wicakpe ota nin pelo.

Sina Gleska Oyate etan Wicasa eya makocesitomani slolwicaya pelo. Ehani waniyetu yamni he han Tunkasila wicasa ki lena wicayunihan pelo.

Sina Gleska Oyate ki isnalapi sni, nainjejan lena oyate ki pi Cherokee, Choc-taw, Comanche, Pawnee, Seminole, Osage, Kiowa, nahan Hopi akicita he tanpi. Ho, nahan wicasa ake wanji Oceti Sakowin u pelo.

Le ake wanji ki he John Bear King of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe; Simon Broken Leg and Iver Crow Eagle, Sr. of the Rosebud

Sioux Tribe; Eddie Eagle Boy and Phillip LaBlanc of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe; Baptiste Pumpkinseed of the Oglala Sioux Tribe; Edmund St. John of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe; and Walter C. John of the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska—numlala ni unpi. Charlie Whitepipe hecena niun.

1941 he han akicita el ic'icu, hetan California ekta iyeyapi nahan heceya un he han Pearl Harbor tiektiypapi. He ihaniyuhehan Hawaii ekta iyeyapi, ho nahan hetan New Guinea ekta iyeya pelo.

New Guinea ekta un hehan wicasa wan Inyan oblecahan etanhan itancan ki okiyaki na Charlie Whitepipe atunwan ki waste kte cin Lakota ki lila wicasapi sni nahan waecun unspepi yelo. Le wicasa ki waeyo hehan Charlie Whitepipe iyohpi sni cin Lakota ki hececapi sni, eyas itacan ki hecetula ca Charlie Whitepipe waniyutu num atuwan wicasa heca. Ho nahan, Lakota woiye un wata wan el Lakota wan kici woglake.

1944 hehan lila kuje ka glicuyapi.

Charlie Whitepipe gli hahan taicutun na wakanyeya sakpe icahwice.

Ho hetan waniyetu wikcemna yamni Rural Electric Association hel wowasecun. Ta cinca wan atkuku ki anpetu ki oyohi wasecun, ho nahan anpetu wakan canasna tiwahe tawa ki iyuha wakekiye awinca iye.

Wana Charlie Whitepipe waniyetu saglokan ake sakpe. Lehanl wicasa ki le nunhean natakuni nahun sni icin okicize ekta un, hehanl wanapobiyab ki nuge ki yusicipi. Wicasa ki let tiwahe tawa ki tehkila.

Clarence Wolf Guts injiyan nahahcini un, nahan injiya Lakota woiye nahan woglake un okicize ekta wacinuampi.

Ta kola ku kici, Iver Crow Eagle, Sr., akicita el ic'icupi.

Alabama ekta eye wicayapi. Heciya itacan ki wanji ablezina Iver nahan Clarence Lakota woglake nahan wayawa okihipi. Mr. Wolf Guts oglakina akicita itacan ki lila oiyokipi.

Clarence Wolf Guts akicita ota itacan ki omami. Ho nahan, Iver Crow Eagle, Sr., injeyan akicita itaca wan ki cin wasecun. Lena Wicasa ki tahansi kiciyapi.

Waniyetu yamni Iver nahan Clarence wita ecehel manipi.

Lakota wowiye un wowapi wan kagapi. Le wowapi ki akicita ki unpi. Anpetu wanji Clarence wacekiya, "Wakan Tanka tanyan waki hantas ohihanke wanjini cecicin kte."

Clarence wacekiye ki he osi'icu.

Clarence Wolf Guts Pine Ridge ekta Tanya gli. Taicutun nainjiyan wakanyeya sakpe icahwice.

Lehanl waniyetu wikcemna saglokan. Akicita ki mani cansna el opa.

Tuwa tokiya Lakol woiye un okicize el un ki he Ihuntuwan Dakota Oyate ki epi. World War I nahan World War II Lakota woiye okicize el un ki ogahniga sni ca, lial taku ota ecun na eyab okihipi.

Lena wicasa ki toheki lila wohanke ki he lena wicasa ki okicize el unpi, nahan iyeca hena hecunpi.

Charlie Whitepipe nahan Clarence Wolf Guts wakanyeya pu hehan Lakota ecela unspepi. Ho eyas, wana wayapi hehan Lakota woglake okihip sni. Wasicu ecela woglake okihipi. Lakota woglake hantas awicapapi naha tehiya wicakowap. Nahan hunh t'api.

Le iwanglakap cansna lila oyohsice na waste sni. Hehan Mila Hanska ki Oceti Sakowin Oyate tehkiya wicakowapi. Lakol wicoh'an ki unkip wacinpi.

Lecel oyate ki owicakowap eyas hecana wicasa na winyan ic'icu. Mila Hanska Oyate okicize wanji el iyab canasna Lakota winyan na wicasa akita el eci'cupi.

Akicita wan Sheldon Hawk Eagle eciyapi ca He Sapa National Cemetary el eyonpap le waniyetu hehan le koskalaka ki okicize el lecala t'e.

Le 4th of July hehan akicita ki manipi ca ob wamani. Le Sisseton-Wahpeton Reservation el mawani. Hehan wicasa num Iraq ekta okicize hetan glipi.

He hanhehan hehan He Sapa ekta akicita wica uonihanpi ca el waun.

Akicita ki wica yuonihanpi ota, ho eyas, Lakota woiye akicita ki hena isнала wicayunihan wacin.

Taku wan lila iblukkan ki he le akicita eya woiye ki hena Tunkasila wicayunihan ki waste kte. World War I na World War II makasitomani akicita eya iwaglake ki lena woyuonihan wakantuye ic'u wacin.

Wowapi wan lel awahi, le wowapi tuweki iyuha ikipi kte. Senator Inhofe kici, nahan Tim Johnson awahi. Waniyetu nupa hehan wowapi lecel unkohipi, eyas hunk sam kahinhpeya najinpi.

Akicita eya Charlie Whitepipe na Clarence Wolf Guts oyate ecetkiya waecunpi le un wayuonihan wakantuya wicun'kup waste ke yelo. Lena wicasa ki ecani el un kte sni, ca le waniyetu ki unkiqluwitap na wowapi ki le unyuwastepe ki waste ktelo.

Lankun taku ecun'kun kte ki he akicita ki lena taky ewojawab ki hena wicunkub ki waste kte. Akicita okuju tipi hena muza ska iyena yuhap ki waste kte. Lena oyate ki Wolakota wowapi waste kte. Lena oyate ki Wolakota wowapi wanji kici unkagapi. Taku wowapi ki le na eya ki unkinyejan ecunkun waste ke.

Na lena winyan na wicasa ki wicasyuonihanpi ki ta woiye ki un inipi.

Makasitomni lakol woiye ki lila oh'kankoya takuni sni ehani kohta yamni woiye waglakapi le hanl wikcemna num woiye waglapi.

Tuwiki yuha takun ecunp sni tantas lakol wicoh'an nahan lakol woye ki wanic'in kte.

Lakol wicoh'an na lakol woiye ki un wakanyeya ki tan icagapi. Lena ungluzapi ki waste kte. Lecel oyate ki niupi kte.

1990 hehan Senator Inouye wowapi wan lel ahi, ho ca iyuha walakapi, na luwastepe. He wowapi ki Lakota Oyate ki makasitomni lakol wicoh'an na woiye yuwas'ake.

Senator Inouye nakun wowapi lel ahi he owayawa tipi ki lena muza ska wicaku hecel lakol wicoh'an ki wakanyeya ki unspe okte. Ateyapi Bush wowapi wan caje ki owa. Wowapi wan woiye ke lena tanyan wacin kte, ca wowapi yamni el caje ke owa. Le wowayepi ki waste.

Akicita ki okicize el yapi hecel ta wakanyeya ki tanyan unpi kte, na tiwahe oyunihanpi uncinpi. Le wowapi ki unyunwastepe wacin.

Le ecunkunpi ki hanta taku unkablezap seca?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. I ask the Chair to notify me after 15 minutes of my time has expired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

9/11 COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, the report from the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States will be coming out today. There has been some dribbling out of information about what that report might contain, but we are not going to know

for sure the full content of that report until we get a briefing. I am excited that a good portion of the report is going to be released to the public. I am always of the belief that we need to have an open dialog about issues and where there are shortcomings so that we can come up with the answers and solutions that will serve us best.

I do not think any one group of people or even one individual has all the answers. So I think the more dialog we can get as a result of this report, the better. But I do think it serves us well to think about where we are today, and how it is we got to where we are.

The President came into office about 3½ years ago. He was elected in 2000. He had not even been in office a full year when all of a sudden we had 9/11. What has emerged is that we have a serious problem with terrorism.

Historically, if we look back through the 1990s, we see that there was an emerging problem, which many of us did not recognize as serious as it turned out to be, and most of us did not realize that a series of events would eventually culminate into 9/11 and eventually a finishing off of the war with Iraq. There was a pattern, in looking back.

By the way, it is always easy to look back and say we should have done this and we should have done that, but it is much more difficult to be prospective and say this is the information that is before us and this is what is going to happen in the future.

What was happening in the 1990s was a persistent pattern of boldness in the size and the number of terrorist attacks that were occurring throughout the world. They started with car bombs, and we still have car bombs today. Then they added attacks on embassies. We had an attack on the Khobar Towers. We had an attack on the USS Cole. We had planes bombed by terrorists. We had a partially successful attack from terrorists in New York, and then all of a sudden it built up to the ultimate, which was the 9/11 attack in this country which brought down the Twin Towers in New York, and there was also an attack on the Pentagon, which is the first time this country had been attacked on its own soil since Pearl Harbor.

This was very much an awakening for the Congress, as well as the American people. This President should be commended for rising to the challenges of 9/11, and I think we have the right President in office at the right time. He sent a strong message to the world that was important to send, and that message was that we are not going to tolerate terrorism, and if there are any other countries that are going to support terrorist attacks, either directly or indirectly, they are going to be considered part of the problem as we resolve these issues related to terrorism.

As a result, he had to take some very strong stances. We had to take some very strong positions.

Eventually, what evolved is that Afghanistan was the center. The Presi-

dent dealt first with Afghanistan. Afghanistan was pretty much the center of a lot of the terrorist activities. The Government had been taken over by the terrorists. Afghanistan as a country was being used as a training ground for terrorists who were exporting terrorism throughout the world.

Today, Afghanistan is now a democracy, moving toward more freedom for its people, and getting terrorism under control. It has some challenges with economic growth, but I think President Karzai has done a tremendous job. This all happened because of strong action by this President in moving forward.

We saw that many of these terrorist groups, al-Qaida, for example, had their origins in Saudi Arabia. We saw many terrorist groups that were raising money through Saudi Arabia. Today, Saudi Arabia has recognized the problem and taken some very strong actions. They are working with the United States to control terrorism within their own country.

We have Libya and Muammar Qadhafi, who was exporting terrorism and actually attempting to develop a nuclear weapons program in his own country. Now he has backed off and said, look, we want to work with the United States. He has come out and publicly opposed terrorism. He has given up his nuclear program. The nuclear inspectors can now go into his country and look for nuclear materials.

We have made remarkable progress in Afghanistan. I know we have remarkable progress in Saudi Arabia. We have made remarkable progress in Libya. Even in North Korea we seem to sense more willingness on their part at least to sit down with the United States and negotiate with the United States on how it is we can move toward a more peaceful environment.

Finally, that brings us to Iraq. I think that is another remarkable achievement for this administration. Even though there are some differences of opinion about how this should have been handled, the fact is a large majority of the Senate, working with the President and working with the United Nations, realized terrorism was a problem and Iraq was a part of this problem.

The President decided to invade Iraq and Saddam Hussein. It was a good decision. I need to remind Members this war started actually before then. It started under his father, the first President George Bush. The first President George Bush had to deal with an invasion by Saddam Hussein into the country of Kuwait. He soundly defeated Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein agreed to sign a treaty and in that treaty he agreed to allow inspectors into his country. He agreed to many provisions that were being stipulated by the United Nations. He agreed to certain no-fly zones.

We attempted to enforce those no-fly zones as he was constantly shooting at our planes. After the first conflict, Saddam Hussein ignored what he had

agreed to with the first President George Bush. Then we had the United Nations inspectors going in and looking for nuclear materials, weapons of mass destruction, and they were kicked out of that country.

The Congress and the United Nations all agreed this was an unstable situation and something needed to be done with Saddam Hussein. So George Bush, who is now our President, made the right decision in saying we need to go into Iraq and we need to deal with this unstable situation because it is a persistent threat to world peace. If we do not deal with the problem now, it is only going to get worse with time. I have to say this President has done a great job. He has the support of the American people.

Now this national commission on terrorist attacks upon the United States is going to reveal some shortcomings and we are going to need to address those. Our Nation has a leader who has made it clear that winning the war on terror is the defining moment for the civilized world.

Since September 11, 2001, President Bush has taken some bold steps to ensure the safety and security of the United States, specifically against terrorist organizations and the nation states that support them. Specifically, since President Bush has taken office, the United States, under his leadership, has overthrown two terrorist regimes, rescued two nations and liberated over 50 million people, captured or killed close to two-thirds of known senior al-Qaida operatives, captured or killed 45 of the 55 most wanted in Iraq, including Iraq's deposed dictator, Saddam Hussein, who is now sitting in jail, hunted down thousands of terrorist and regime remnants in Iraq, disrupted terrorist cells on most continents and likely prevented a number of planned attacks. This is an astounding record of accomplishment for our commander in chief and his national security staff.

We also have to recognize the phenomenal job of our men and women in our military services. They have been phenomenal and I do not think we can repeat that enough. We are very fortunate to have their dedication and commitment, not only of the men and women who are serving in these services, but their families and their communities back home who support them.

The United States went to war in Afghanistan and Iraq risking significant loss of life and treasure to protect our way of life. Our goals are clear and twofold: Destroy the nexus of terrorism and weapons of mass murder that personify the two ousted regimes and create in their stead stable democratic states able to participate in the modern world community.

We succeeded in our first goal, having killed or captured perpetrators and supporters of the enemy terrorists. The courageous people of Afghanistan and Iraq are making remarkable progress toward adoption of constitutional reforms to secure momentum toward

lasting democratic independence. Nevertheless, we still have work to do.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence report on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction clearly identified what we have all known for some time, our intelligence has not performed in as desirable a way as we would like and in some cases has raised some issues about some of the decisions we had to make in this Congress.

As a former member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I say to my colleagues that few employees in the Federal Government are as dedicated as those who work for our intelligence agencies. They are hard-working individuals who believe their work is critical to our Nation's national security, and they provide us good information. As policymakers, we also have to recognize the information they give us is not always absolute. A lot of time it is a little bit of information here, a little bit of information there, and we have to put it together and say this is a likely event that is going to happen or this is likely what is happening. It is not absolute in many regards, and we have to treat it that way.

I think that is the way the President treated it, and I think that is the way the Congress has looked at much of the information that we received right after 9/11 and how terrorism is affecting us. That is why it was so frustrating to learn our intelligence agencies did not connect many of the dots in regard to September 11 and again failed to provide reliable information on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs.

We clearly have a considerable amount of work to do. As the Senate Intelligence Committee recommended, we need to improve the process by which analysts, collectors, and managers fuse intelligence and produce judgments for policymakers, but that is not new. We have been facing this problem for some time. I am glad we are taking it more seriously. We need to greatly enhance almost every aspect of the intelligence community's human intelligence efforts. We need to address the tendency to build upon the judgments of previous assessments without including the uncertainties in those assessments.

I will note the Senate Intelligence Committee's report did conclude that the intelligence community's judgments regarding Saddam Hussein's government's link to terrorist organizations were reasonable. Equally important was the Senate Intelligence Committee's conclusion that the exaggeration of the intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities was not the result of political pressure.

As we prepare for the 9/11 Commission's report, I think it is appropriate that we thank the people who served on the Commission for their service to this country. Their service will go a long way to helping our Nation prevent future attacks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALBENT). Who seeks recognition?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to make remarks today on two important subjects with which we are currently dealing in the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, "Did the Bush administration manipulate intelligence about Saddam Hussein's weapons program to justify an invasion of Iraq?" This is the central question posed by discredited Ambassador Joe Wilson in his July 6, 2003, op-ed published by the New York Times.

Wilson alleged the answer to the question was "yes", and a political firestorm ensued. Indeed, the year-long furor over the infamous 16 words stemmed from Mr. Wilson's disproved claims.

Many of the President's fiercest critics have since argued the Bush administration misled the country into war, a truly incendiary charge.

Lord Butler's comprehensive report includes the real 16-word statement we should focus on. Here is what he had to say:

We conclude that the statement in President Bush's State of the Union address . . . is well founded.

It is well founded. Yet the New York Times threw its hat into the ring early and ran an editorial on July 12, 2003 amplifying Wilson's irresponsible claim and flaming the fires of this pseudo-scandal. This is what they had to say:

Now the American people need to know how the accusation got into the speech in the first place, and whether it was put there with an intent to deceive the nation. The White House has a lot of explaining to do.

Will the New York Times, which printed 70 stories that repeated Joe Wilson's claims, now retract this editorial? Will it acknowledge on the editorial page the truth about Joe Wilson?

Rather than displaying caution and restraint, too many American politicians raced, like the New York Times, to echo this outrageous allegation.

Early into the fray was the senior Senator from North Carolina. On July 22, 2003, Fox News played a clip from one of Senator EDWARDS' rallies in which he repeats Wilson's attacks on the President's honesty. Senator EDWARDS claims:

Nothing is more important than the credibility of the president of the United States and the words that come out of his mouth at the State of the Union are, in fact, the responsibility of the president.

According to the correspondent at the rally:

Edwards blasted the president's 16-word State of the Union sentence on British intelligence information that Iraq sought nuclear weapons material from Africa.

Now a candidate for the Vice Presidency, Senator EDWARDS will have many media opportunities to set the

record straight about his view of the President's State of the Union speech. In the name of fairness, I sure hope he will.

Not to be outdone, the Senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, delivered an attack on the Bush administration this January. Senator KENNEDY repeated Wilson's distortions, and claimed:

The gross abuse of intelligence was on full display in the president's State of the Union address last January, when he spoke the now infamous 16 words. . . . And as we all know now, that allegation was false. . . . President Bush and his advisers should have presented their case honestly.

When will Senator KENNEDY acknowledge that the President's claim was "well founded?" The junior Senator from Massachusetts has also accused the President of misleading the country. An Associated Press report from 2003 includes an exchange between Senator KERRY and a woman on the campaign trail. Here is how it went.

When a woman asked whether U.S. intelligence on Iraq was doctored, Kerry replies that Americans were "clearly misled" on two specific pieces of intelligence. "I will not let him off the hook throughout this campaign with respect to America's credibility

That is the junior Senator from Massachusetts. Let me quote another AP report about Senator KERRY from last summer:

Kerry said Bush made his case for war based on U.S. intelligence that now appear to be wrong—that Iraq sought nuclear material from Africa.

Now that Joe Wilson's claims have been completely discredited, the junior Senator from Massachusetts has a chance to set the record straight. But will he?

I mentioned yesterday the distinguished Minority Leader had repeated Joe Wilson's discredited claims on the Senate Floor. Just last month, Senator DASCHLE said:

Sunlight, it's been said, is the best disinfectant. But for too long, the administration has been able to keep Congress and the American people in the dark . . . serious matters, such as the manipulation of intelligence about Iraq, have received only fitful attention.

The bipartisan Senate Intelligence Report reached the following conclusions that directly refute the serious charges made by the President's critics:

Conclusion 83. The Committee did not find any evidence that Administration officials attempted to coerce, influence, or pressure analysts to change their judgments related to Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities.

Conclusion 84. The Committee found no evidence that the Vice President's visits to the CIA were attempts to pressure analysts, were perceived as intended to pressure analysts by those who participated in the briefings on Iraq's WMD programs, or did pressure analysts to change their assessments.

Let us not allow honesty to become a casualty of the campaign season.

My colleagues now have an opportunity—and I am sure they will take